

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 19-27 and 31-38 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 19-27 and 31-38 are rejected. Amendments to the application are shown above. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 19-27 and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirsch (U.S. 6,263,339) in view of Williams (U.S. 6,591, 272).

Claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

A method of creating programmable data objects for use in a multi-tier computing architecture, the method comprising:

dragging a graphical representation for a server processing resource from a server explorer module to a visual design surface module to add a processing item to a middle-tier stateless programmable data object being created in the visual design surface module, wherein a client process to communicate with the server processing resource through the middle-tier stateless programmable data object using stateless data transfer, wherein stateless data transfer includes receiving a message from the client at the server processing resource that includes:

a first indicia that indicates an original state of data previously requested by the client from the server processing resource; and
a second indicia that indicates changes to the requested data,
wherein a current state of the requested data is determined by comparing the first indicia and the second indicia;

identifying data schema associated with the server processing resource added to the middle-tier stateless programmable data object in response to the server processing resource being dropped in the visual design surface module;

creating a typed dataset containing data structures corresponding to the data schema associated with the server processing resource;

Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure – Technology Center 2100
PATENT

creating a command adapter to provide data transfer commands within the middle-tier stateless programmable data object between the middle-tier stateless programmable data object and the server processing resource; and

creating a data transfer connection between the middle-tier stateless programmable data object and the server processing resource.

No new matter has been added; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least page 7, line 7, to page 8, line 16, of the Applicant's specification as originally filed.

On page 4 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Hirsch does not explicitly disclose utilizing a middle-tier stateless data object and stateless data transfer. The Examiner cites Williams as disclosing a middle-tier stateless data object and stateless data transfer.

Williams is directed to transmitting objects from a database on a server to a client computer. Williams describes stateless operations between the database and clients (col. 18, lines 35-47). Williams also describes maintaining currency of data at the client (col. 28, line 60, to col. 29, line 5). However, Williams fails to disclose

"wherein stateless data transfer includes receiving a message from the client at the server processing resource that includes:

a first indicia that indicates an original state of data previously requested by the client from the server processing resource; and

a second indicia that indicates changes to the requested data, wherein a current state of the requested data is determined by comparing the first indicia and the second indicia"

as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Thus, Hirsch and Williams, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Independent claims 7, 13 and 19 distinguish from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2, 8, 14, 20–27 and 31–38 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claims in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.


Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure – Technology Center 2100
PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: December 21, 2006

By 

Anthony H. Azure, Reg. No.: 52,580
Attorney for Applicant
Direct telephone (425) 707-0399
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

December 21, 2006

Date


Signature

Noemi Tovar
Printed Name

Reply to Final Office Action mailed Oct. 23, 2006
Application Number: 09/734,072
Attorney Docket Number: 146960.01